DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 270 634 CE 044 594

AUTHOR Mowsesian, Richard
TITLE Social Entitlements and Career Patterns.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (70th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; Educational Quality; Employee Attitudes; Employment Level; *Environmental Standards; *Life Satisfaction; Living Standards; *Quality of Life; *Semiskilled Workers; Social Environment; *Social Indicators; Socioeconomic Status
IDENTIFIERS *Social Entitlements

ABSTRACT

An Entitlement Scale (ES) was developed to assess people's beliefs regarding their societal rights. The 35-item scale was administered to 174 subjects ranging in age from 19 to 83 and representing diverse occupational clusters. Four clear factors emerged reflecting distinct domains of entitlement beliefs: work life and education, individuality, fair treatment, and environment. The highest expectations of entitlement were held by younger people, women, and semiskilled workers. Less skilled workers or nonworkers held lower expectations of entitlement. More highly educated persons had fewer expectations of entitlement except on the individuality and environment domains. Entitlement expectations may portend troubles in labor relations for semiskilled workers. Counselors should note entitlement expectations of their clients and expect conflict if expectations, work setting, and occupational group are not consistent. Entitlement beliefs appear to play an important role in the demands that people place upon others and upon their society at large. The Entitlement Scale, with its four constituent subscales, provides a useful instrument for future work in the area. A two-page list of references concludes the study. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SOCIAL ENTITLEMENTS AND CAREER PATTERNS*

Richard Mowsesian

The University of Texas at Austin

ED270634

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R Mowsesian

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE044594

Running Head: Entitlement, Career Patterns

*Paperpresented at the National Convention of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, Calif., April 1986.

ABSTRACT

An Entitlement Scale (ES) was developed to assess people's beliefs regarding their societal rights. The 35 - item scale was administered to 174 subjects ranging in age from 19 to 83 and representing diverse occupational clusters. Four clear factors emerged reflecting distinct domains of entitlement beliefs: Worklife and Education, Individuality, Fair Treatment, and Environment. Sex, age, and occupational group differences were obtained as expected for all four factors. The nature of entitlement beliefs and their role in behavior are discussed.

Social Entitlements and Career Patterns

The explosion of social movements during the 1960s and on into the 1970s has highlighted an emerging set of values, attitudes, and beliefs so markedly different from the traditional that they promise to transform the social character of a traditional American society. Members of the "baby boom" generation, for example, born in the years between 1946 and 1964, have tended to deny the importance of traditional norms such as that one should subordinate oneself to a complex network of obligations to others and delay gratification of one's desires (Jones, 1980; Yankelovich, 1979). The traditional American society was founded upon the assumption that individuals have certain rights -- that they are entitled, for example to have a voice in government and to worship as they please. In recent years, however, the concept of "right" has broadened to include a variety of entitlements not previously recognized as rights.

There seems to be emerging a growing conviction in society that individuals have a <u>right</u> to a variety of entitlements previously assumed to be acquired through performance or hard work. Such convictions are accompanying changes in attitudes and values. The younger generations of Americans assume that they were born with certain rights and entitlements that are not recognized by their elders (Yankelovich, 1974). Jones (1980) has suggested that the younger

generations were taught to believe that such rights are givens. Katzell (1979) noted that young adults have "become increasingly prone to reject the traditional values of workmanship, career advancement, and financial success in favor of self-determination, self-realization, and creating the good society" (p.40). As a result of the post World War II prosperity, "Baby boomers" grew up with their basic needs fulfilled, allowing them the freedom to concentrate on "higher-order" needs and leading them to expand the concept of social rights (Mastekaasa, 1983). In addition to increasing demands for more civil rights, there is an increase in the sentiment that people are entitled to complete personal freedom, interesting and challenging work, a substantial voice in what goes on in the world, as well as self-fulfillment and the right to live by one's own rules (Katzell, 1979).

It is anticipated that as these movements (changing values and beliefs in entitlements) become more and more a part of the social norm, counselors will need to be sensitive to the profound effect such social changes will have on the career choices, decision-making, and career patterns of their clients. The "linear life plan" so much a part of traditional society is giving way to circular life plans (Stern & Best, 1977) and the assumptions underlying the "one life-one career" imperative about which Sarasan (1977) speaks is giving way to multiple career plans and career options. In addition to Katezall's (1979) observations reported above, Jones (1980) pointed out that the "Baby Boomers" have been both denying and rebelling against traditional views. As such, they are defining new, and sometimes disquieting, ways of behaving and living. Yankelovich (1974) identified these

changes among the new generation of Americans as an emerging "Psychology of Entitlement." Apparently, the new generation of American assumes that certain rights and entitlements are theirs simply because they were born with them. As a result, Yankelovich (1974) has defined a "Psychology of Entitlement" as the psychological process whereby a person's wants or desires become converted into a set of presumed rights. Assuming such changes are occuring, then implications for career counseling seem obvious. Such questions as : Can clients fulfill their wants and desires through their career choice? What career pattern will a client need to follow in order to realize those social entitlements they have come to expect and presume are their right?

Our interest in entitlement was stimulated by peoples' comments regarding entitlements they perceived were their due, comments that were made without any apparent basis. For example, many students seem to hold the belief that, "I have a right to a high paying job when I get my degree," a belief that differs substantially from the view that "If I work hard, study, and get good grades, I have a chance to get a high paying job." The latter is a reflection of the traditional Protestant Work Ethic which emphasized that job-related rewards are contingent upon hard work, whereas the former is an expression of an emerging entitlement system that affirms that a job is a right rather than a privilege (Dalton, 1977; Katzell, 1979).

Purpose

The purpose of this investigation is to expand the study reported

by Mowsesian and Leary (1986) and report on the entitlement perceptions of individuals according to occupational clusters. Based upon the findings reported by Mowsesian and Leary (1986), it is hypothesized that the more professional is the occupational cluster the lower is the expectation of social entitlements. Finally, there will be a summary reporting of Mowsesian and Leary's findings regarding an Entitlement Scale (ES) they developed as well as how their findings relate to the primary question of this investigation.

Methodology

A thirty-five item Entitlement Scale along with a demographic data form (ES), developed by Mowsesian and Leary (1986), was administered to 192 subjects. These subjects ranged in age from 19 to 83. There were 104 females and 88 males. Age and sex characteristics suggest a diverse and heterogeneous group. As will be seen later, this group was also diverse in their occupations which provides further evidance for hetrogeneity. Such hetrogeneity was felt to be important in order to establish the instrument's factor structure as well as provide the diversity of information needed to address the questions under consideration. Subjects were recruted from university classrooms (32%),civic groups, social gatherings, work settings, and a variety of individual sources (68%). This subject pool was the same subject pool used by Mowsesian and Leary for their study and constitutes the data base to address the primary question for this investigation.

Factor analysis was used to analyze the ES item response and will be reported in the results section. Analysis of variance techniques were used to assertain if differential response patterns by sex, age, and occupational group were discernable on the ES.

Results

Factor Analysis

The data were analyzed by Mowsesian and Leary (1986) using a principal axes analysis. Four factors emerged accounting for 93.3% of the common variance. A varimax rotation was performed revealing a four factor structor that included thirty four of the thirty five items. Eigenvalues for the first four factors were: 14.9, 3.27, 1.48, and .80. Although Factor IV's eigenvalue did not exceed 1, it was felt to be sufficiently high to be included as part of the ES and failure to retain four factors resulted in obvious factor compression (see Guertin & Bailey, 1970). The thirty four items that made the largest contribution to the four factor solution (factor loadings >.40) are reported in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Factor I which reflects entitlements associated with work and education accounted for fifteen items. Factor II, accounting for nine items, was labeled individuality. Factor III, six items, was called fair treatment and factor IV, four items, was called environmental. One item (I am entitled to choose how and when to die, insofar as possible)

did not load on any factor, nor did it emerge as a singlet. Thus, this item was dropped from all further analyses. Further investigation into entitlements regarding death may be warrented in a separate study.

Reliability and Intercorrelations

Correlations between items and the total scale score range from .18 (item 20) to .72 (item 5) with the majority above .50 (see Table 2). When correlations between single items and the four "subscale" scores are examined, only two item-to-subscale reliability coefficients fall below .50. Cronbach's alpha for the total scale was .95 and subscale reliability coefficients range from .75 (Factor IV) to .94 (Factor I). (Scale alphas are reported in Table 3.) In brief, item total correlations and scale reliabilities are quite acceptable.

Insert Tables 2 and 3 about here

Correlations between the four subscales are presented in Table 3. An examination of these data reveal that the four scales correlate moderately positively with each other suggesting a single construct with four subscales. It is interesting to note that Scale III, Fair Treatment, correlates highest with the other three scales. This would seem to suggest that concern with being treated fairly is implied to some degree by the other dimensions of entitlement. (See Katzell, 1979, for a related observation.)

Sex and Age Differences

Scores on the ES were examined as a function of age and sex. The

results of these analyses are shown in Tables 4 and 5. Analyses showed that females scored higher on the total ES scale and on each of the four subscales than did males. Further, as expected, younger respondents scored higher on the ES (indicating a greater sense of entitlement) than older respondents. Post hoc comparisons showed that the youngest (age 22 and under) and older (over 40) age groups differed significantly on all scales. With the exception of Fair Treatment, strong differences were also observed between the middle age group (age 23 - 40) and the 41 plus group. Smaller differences were obtained between the two younger ages, suggesting that the two younger groups are more alike with eachother than they are with the older group.

Insert Tables 4 and 5 about here

A two way analysis of variance revealed that when age by sex comparisons are made, females, regardless of age, scored higher on all ES scales within age groups than did males. However, younger males tended to score higher than older females suggesting that age differences hold regardless of sex.

Occupational Group Differences

Finally, scores on the ES were examined as a function of occupational group. The result of this analysis is presented in Table 6. A review of these data indicate that the No Response and Semi-Skilled groups perceived themselves to be more entitled than any of the other groups with the Unskilled group perceiving themselves to be the least

entitled group. The Semi-Skilled and No Response groups were consistantly high on all subscales, with the exception of Individuality for the No Response group, than all other groups. Conversly, the Unskilled group's expectation of entitlements were consistantly lower than any of the other groups on all scales. Interestingly, while we observed earlier that females perceived more entitlements for themselves than did males, Housewives believed they were more entitled in their Work Life and Education than any other single group. In general, the major concern of this investigation is confirmed at least with regard to the semi-skilled group, the higher is the occupational group to which one belongs the lower is the expected entitlement with the exception of Individuality and Environmental being almost equally high among the professional group. However, a confounding observation may be seen in that in terms of Total score, both the Unskilled and Professional groups perceived their level of entitlement to be lower than all other groups. Why the Unskilled group scores are so low cannot be answered from these data. It may be speculated that the sample size is so small (N =5) that they are not truely representative. Thus, these findings must be viewed with caution.

Discussion

Although the concept of entitlement has been discussed at a conceptual and theoretical level (Jones, 1980; Katzell, 1979; Yankelovich, 1974, 1979, 1981), little empirical work has been conducted. The present study along with the Mowsesian and Leary (1986) study provides both a useful research tool and a suggestive use of the tool for future work on a variety of topics at both a sociological

and a psychological level of analysis. For example, investigation into work attitudes and satisfaction both within and between occupational groups should explore the role of workers' worklife entitlement beliefs as they relate to their demands for better working conditions (cf. Dale, 1984; Gerson, 1984). Similarly, the degree to which people endorse and become involved in social movements (such as the women's and antinuclear movements) may be based directly upon their personal systems of entitlement beliefs. These beliefs may also predict the degree to which politicians at all levels support entitlement programs.

The data regarding differences in entitlement beliefs among age groups supports Jones' (1980) assertion that "baby boomers" endorse entitlements more strongly than older generations. Respondents in the 23 to 40 age group expressed a stronger sense of entitlement than the 41 to 83 age group on all dimensions except "Fair Treatment". Similarly, the post baby boomer generation (age 19 to 22 in the present sample) were similar to the baby boomers, differing from the oldest group on all four factors. This finding suggests that we can expect demands for rights to continue, if not increase, in the future as the political power of the two younger generations expands.

The finding that women in our sample expressed a greater sense of entitlement than males on all four dimensions may reflect the prevailing Zeitgeist surrounding the woman's movement. Perhaps for the first time, women of all ages have begun to question how they are treated at work and school, in their private lives, and as citizens. Some of the obtained sex differences in entitlement may reflect real inequities; for example, despite dramatic changes, women's career

opportunities are still more limited than men's and social norms allow women less freedom and "individuality." However, existing status differences between men and women do not explain why women insist more strongly than men that they are entitled to a pollution-free environment. One possibility is that, in early years of a social "entitlement" movement, proponents are likely to be particularly conscious of their various "rights," aware of infringements upon those rights, and particularly vehement about their restoration.

The finding that the Semi-Skilled group were consistantly higher in entitlement beliefs than any other group overall is consistant with expectations. What was a supprise was that the Unskilled group was consistantly lower in their entitlement expectations. This last observation may be an artifact of the small sample size and the wide variation of response among this group (their standard deviation was the largest of all the groups). Professional occupational groups were also high on Individuality and Enviromental as one might expect from reading the professional and popular literature. One speculation is worthy of note at this point and perhaps suggestive of future research. If the finding concerning the Semi-Skilled workers holds in future studies, then within company worker conflicts as well as product quality might be directly related to the workers level of expected entitlement. Finally, counselors will do well to note the level of entitlements of their clients as they relate to the occupational grouping to which their clients aspire. If occupatinal group and work setting is not consistant with client entitlement expectations then potential conflicts may arise.

In sum, entitlement beliefs appear to play an important role in the demands that people place upon others and upon their society at large. The Entitlement Scale, with its four constituent subscales, provides a useful instrument for future work in the area.

References

Dale, R. (1984) Chapter in I. Azimov et al. (Eds.), Work in the 21st century (pp. 123 - 130). Washington, D. C.: The American Society of Personnel Administration.

Dalton, R. J. (1977) Was there a revolution? A note of generational versus life-cycle explanations of value differences. Comparative Political Studies, 9, 459 -475.

Gerson, H. E. (1984) Chapter in I. Azimov et al. (Eds.), Work in the 21st century (pp. 91 - 96). Washington, D. C.: The American Society for Personnel Administration.

Guertin, W. H., & Bailey, J. P. (1970). Introduction to modern factor analysis. Ann Arbor, MI: Edwards Bros., Inc.

Jones, L. Y. (1980) Great expectations: America and the baby boom generation. New York: Coward, McCann, & Geoghegan.

Katzell, R. A. (1979) Changing attitudes toward work. In C. Kerr & J. M. Rosow (Eds.), Work in America: The decade ahead (pp. 35 - 57). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co.

Mastekaasa, A. (1983). Post materialist values and subjective satisfaction: Testing Ronald Inglehart's hypotheses. Acta

Sociologica, 26, 141 - 159.

Mowsesian, R. & Leary, M. The psychology of entitlement: Theory and Assessment. Journal of personality and social psychology. (in press).

Sarason, S. B. (1977) Work, aging, and social change. New York: The Free Press.

Stern, B. & Best, F. (1979) Cyclic life patterns. In D. W. Vermilye (Ed.), Relating work and education (pp. 250 - 267). San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass.

Yankelovich, D. (1974) The meaning of work. In J. M. Rosow (Ed.), The worker and the job (pp. 19 - 47). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Yankelovich, D. (1979). Work, values, and the new breed. In C. Kerr & J. M. Rosow (Eds.), Work in America: The decade ahead (pp. 3 - 26). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co.

Yankelovich, D. (1981). New Rules. New York: Random House.

Table 1

Entitlement Scale Item Loadings $\geq \pm .40$ on the Varimax Rotated Factors

Item No.	Item	Factor Loading (N=174)
Factor I:	Work Life and Education	
1.	a job which reflects my education and training.	.67
2.	an interesting job.	.76
5.	earn enough money to live comfortably.	.78
6.	a college education.	.76
7.	as much personal fulfillment as possible in my job or career.	.64
9.	the best medical care whether or not I can pay for it.	.53
10.	a job in which I can succeed.	.83
11.	be accepted as I am.	.61
12.	determine what hours I will work on a job.	.72
13.	as much formal education as I can successfully complete.	.63
14.	a college education in a college of my choice.	.77
17.	expect society to provide opportunities in which I can succeed.	.58
18.	a financially secure retirement.	.69
28.	a guaranteed job at a fair rate of compensation.	.69
35.	a job if I want to work.	.56

Table 1, cont.

Factor II: Individuality		
4.	live where I please without social sanctions.	.44
20.	be accepted as I am without having to prove myself to others.	.53
21.	not conform to society's expectations as long as I do not violate any laws.	.78
22.	define my own social norms by which to live.	.66
25.	publically express my individuality.	.65
27.	publically express dissent without fear of reprisal.	.59
29.	live a life style of my own choosing without conforming to social norms.	.76
33.	be different and not conform to society's expectations.	.75
34.	to be a single parent without ever being married.	.54
Factor III: Fair Treatment		
3.	be treated fairly.	.61
15.	be treated fairly by society.	.47
23.	be treated fairly in my job or career.	.69
26.	a chance to be successful in life.	.66
30.	take part in decisions effecting my job.	.57
32.	equality at the "starting line" of life.	.46

Table 1, cont.

Factor IV: Environmental		
8.	breath pollution-free air	.53
19.	a work space in which smoking is not allowed.	.58
24.	live in a pollution-free environment.	.64
31.	drink pollution-free water.	.56

Table 2

Item Total Correlation for Total Scale and Subscale N-174

Item No.	Item-Total Scale Correlation	Item-Subscale Correlation	Subscale Number
1.	.61	.69	I
2.	.63	.75	I
3.	.51	.62	III
4.	.53	.47	II
5.	.72	.81	I
6.	.64	.75	I
7.	.70	.71	I
8.	.43	.55	IV
9.	.59	.56	I
10.	.71	.83	I
11.	.66	.64	I
12.	.57	.67	I
13.	.65	.69	I
14.	.62	.75	I
15.	.58	.64	III
17.	.56	.59	I
18.	.59	.68	I
19.	.18	.38	IV
20.	.56	.53	II
21.	.57	.77	II
22.	.64	.69	II

Table 2, cont.

Item No.	Item-Total Scale Correlation	Item-Subscale Correlation	Subscale Number
23.	.61	.76	III
24.	.60	.74	IV
25.	.52	.67	II
26.	.63	.68	III
27.	.45	.60	II
28.	.64	.70	I
29.	.55	.73	II
30.	.65	.57	III
31.	.46	.59	IV
32.	.56	.61	III
33.	.42	.69	II
34.	.32	.49	II
35.	.55	.57	I

Note. The subscale numbers refer to the factors listed in Table 1.

Table 3

Correlations, Scale Alpha, $\bar{x}$, and SD for Four ES Scales and Total Score* (N=174)

	Scale				
	I**	II	III	IV	Total
I	94	45	64	31	89
II		88	55	50	76
III			85	49	81
IV				75	57
Total					94
$\bar{x}$	56.98	34.31	25.89	16.28	133.09
SD	12.55	7.06	3.91	3.03	21.46

*Scale Alpha underlined in the diagonal

**I=Worklife and Education (15 items)

II=Individuality (9 items)

III=Fair Treatment (16 items)

IV=Environment (4 items)

Total=Total Scale (34 items)

Table 4

$\bar{x}$, SD and p for Sex and ES Scale

Scale			Female (N=104)	Male (N=88)	p
I	Worklife and	$\bar{x}$	51.02	51.52	.001
	Education	SD	11.18	14.41	
II	Individuality	$\bar{x}$	35.06	32.94	.034
		SD	6.01	7.73	
III	Fair Treatment	$\bar{x}$	26.40	24.64	.003
		SD	3.25	4.78	
IV	Environment	$\bar{x}$	16.63	15.61	.025
		SD	2.67	3.56	
V	Total Score	$\bar{x}$	137.12	124.76	.001
		SD	17.53	25.42	

Table 5

Age Differences on Social Entitlement Beliefs

Scale			Age Groups I (19-22) (N=35)	II (23-40) (N=85)	III (41-83) (N=72)	F	p
I	Worklife and	$\bar{x}$	61.29	56.06	52.25	5.836	.004
	Education	SD	10.09	13.06	13.99		
II	Individuality	$\bar{x}$	35.29_a	34.48_a	31.86	6.318	.002
		SD	5.72	7.06	6.78		
III	Fair	$\bar{x}$	26.60_a	25.79_{ab}	24.88_b	2.278	.105
	Treatment	SD	4.28	4.04	4.03		
IV	Environment	$\bar{x}$	16.57_a	16.71_a	15.32	4.361	.014
		SD	2.19	3.00	3.53		
V	Total Score	$\bar{x}$	139.74_a	134.05_a	124.36	7.044	.001
		SD	17.25	22.05	23.00		

Note. Means in a single row sharing a common subscript do not differ significantly, $p > .05$.

TABLE 6

X and SD of Entitlements by Occupational Group

Scale		Student (61)	Profess. (39)	Semi-Profes. (27)	Skilled (11)	Semi-Skilled (25)	Unskil. (5)	House-wife (5)	Retired (14)	No Resp. (5)	F	p
I. Work-life & Education	X	56.39	49.08	54.63	56.55	63.28	50.60	64.06	53.43	63.60	3.149	.002
	SD	10.82	14.71	15.72	10.32	8.76	20.53	6.12	14.46	11.04		
II. Individuality	X	34.23	35.23	33.04	34.36	36.60	28.00	28.60	30.21	34.40	2.437	.016
	SD	6.08	5.83	8.74	4.41	5.88	10.77	5.68	8.39	7.60		
III. Fair-treatment	X	25.25	25.03	26.22	26.91	27.28	22.00	24.80	24.71	26.40	1.534	.148
	SD	4.33	4.37	3.18	2.12	2.44	9.25	3.96	4.14	4.77		
IV. Environmenta	X	16.77	16.69	15.52	14.91	16.80	13.20	15.60	14.43	16.20	2.115	.036
	SD	2.42	3.55	3.36	2.34	2.77	5.81	3.85	3.37	2.49		
V. Total	X	132.64	126.13	129.41	132.73	143.96	113.80	133.00	122.79	144.60	2.308	.022
	SD	17.59	23.85	26.76	15.08	13.53	45.90	12.51	26.47	24.91		

Numbers in parentheses are the N per cell.